

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☐ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.

pg



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/887,524

06/21/2001

Daniel R. Simon

MS1-744US

5744

22801

7590

08/27/2004

LEE & HAYES PLLC

421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500

SPOKANE, WA 99201

EXAMINER

TRUONG, CAM Y T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2172

DATE MAILED: 08/27/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/887,524

Applicant(s)

SIMON ET AL.

Examiner

Cam Y T Truong

Art Unit

2172

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-58 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-58 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 21 June 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-58 are pending in this Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 4 and 36 recites the limitation " the data structures" in lines 1-2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-4, 6-20, 22-36 and 38-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fields et al (or hereinafter "Fields") (US 6605120) in view of Lynch et al (or hereinafter "Lynch") (US 6558431).

As to claim 1, Fields teaches the claimed limitations:

"obtaining input-description-data" as the HTML source (col. 5, lines 15-25);

"transforming the input-description-data into a data structure, wherein the data structure is an organized representation of the input-description-data" as parsing the HTML source for desired components of the page. Typically, this title of the article, the

Art Unit: 2172

ad banner or banners and the article text itself. These pieces of content are then recast into a new web page by means of an HTML template. The above information shows that the HTML source is transformed into an HTML template. The HTML source is represented as the input-description-data. An HTML template is represented as data structure (col. 5, lines 15-25);

“with the organized representation of the input-description-data of the data structure” as these pieces of content of the HTML source is recasted into a new web page (col. 5, lines 20-25);

“automatically generating a set of instructions for filtering input directly provided by a computing component without human intervention” as the pass through publisher 101 retrieves the filter definitions and polices from the filter database 109 for this particular content provider web site. Using filters and retrieved HTML page to parse the HTML source for desired components of the page (col. 5, lines 1-30).

Fields does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation “which define the properties of valid input directly provided by a computing component without human intervention; based upon the properties of valid input defined by the input-description data”.

Lynch teaches that HTML is a structural language that is comprised of HTML elements that are nested within each other. An HTML document is a text file in which certain strings of characters, called tags, mark regions of the document and assign special meaning to them. These regions are called HTML elements. Each element has a name, or tag. An element can have attributes that specify properties of

Art Unit: 2172

the element. Blocks or components include unordered list, text boxes, check boxes, and radio buttons, for example. Each block has properties such as name, type, and value. The following provides an example of the structure of an HTML document: <HTML> <HEAD> . . . element(s) valid in the document head </HEAD> <BODY> . . . element(s) valid in the document body </BODY> </HTML> (col. 3, lines 30-60).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Lynch's teaching of an HTML document contains valid elements to Fields's system in order to eliminate potentially increased server security risks, compromised forms processing efficiency, and caused user frustration.

As to claim 2, Fields teaches the claimed limitation "translating the organized representation of the input-description-data of the data structure into the set of instructions" as (col. 10, lines 1-15).

As to claim 3, Fields teaches the claimed limitation "parsing the organized representation of the input-description-data of the data structure to acquire the input-description-data; synthesizing the set of instructions based upon the input-description-data acquired by the parsing" as (col. 9, lines 55-65; col. 10, lines 1-15).

As to claims 4 and 36, Fields and Lynch disclose the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 1, except the claimed limitation “storing the data structures in a persistent form” as (col. 5, lines 20-30).

As to claim 6, Fields teaches the claimed limitation “wherein the set of instructions as an input filter” as (col. 9, lines 55-65; col. 10, lines 1-15).

As to claims 7 and 55, Fields teaches the claimed limitation “loading the set of instructions as an input filter” as (col. 14, lines 5-20; col. 5, lines 15-20).

As to claim 8, Fields teaches the claimed limitation “wherein the set of instructions is generated with regard to filtering input for an application program module” as (fig. 7, col. 10, lines 1-15).

As to claim 9, Field discloses the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 1, except the claimed limitation “wherein input-description-data define the properties of input selected from a group consisting of valid input only, invalid input only, and both valid and invalid input”. Lynch teaches the validator determines which structures within the document 701 are valid and which are invalid (col. 4, lines 40-45).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Lynch’s teaching of the validator determines which

Art Unit: 2172

structures within the document 701 are valid and which are invalid to Field and Lynch in order to reformat a document corresponding to another format correctly.

As to claims 10, 25, 38, 46, 51, 53 and 56, Fields teaches the claimed limitation “wherein the properties of valid input indicate parameters of input by defining boundary delimitations of such parameters and define assumptions regarding such parameters” as (figs. 6A-6B).

As to claims 11, 26 and 39, Field discloses the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 1, except the claimed limitation “wherein during the obtaining, input-description-data is obtained from a user via a graphical user interface. Lynch teaches that user can select a source as input-description-data to edit via a graphical user interface (fig. 6).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Lynch’s teaching of user can select an source as input-description-data to edit via a graphical user interface to Fields’s system and Lynch’s system in order to allow a user can interact with system and convert input data to another format.

As to claims 12 and 29, Fields teaches the claimed limitation “an application program module configured to receive and respond to input provided by a computing component; an input filter module configured to receive input provided by a computing

Art Unit: 2172

component for the application program module, filter the input, and pass the filtered input to the application program module, wherein the filter comprises one or more sets of instructions that, when executed, filter the input and such sets of instructions being automatically produced according to the method as recited in claim 1" as (col. 5, lines 1-35; col. 10, lines 25-45).

As to claims 13 and 30, Fields teaches the claimed limitation "wherein the computer system comprises a Web server" as (col. 10, lines 35-40).

As to claims 14 and 31, Fields teaches the claimed limitation "wherein the input filter module is further configured to receive input from the computing component via a communications network" as (fig. 9).

As to claims 15, 27 and 47, Fields teaches the claimed limitation "a set of instructions for filtering input, wherein such set of instructions has been automatically produced by the method as recited in claim 1" as (col. 15, lines 30-67).

As to claims 16, 28 and 48, Fields teaches the claimed limitation "an input filter of a computer having computer-executable instructions that, when executed, filter input, wherein such computer-executable instructions were automatically produced by the method as recited in claim 1" as (col. 15, lines 30-67).

Art Unit: 2172

As to claims 17, 32 and 40, Fields teaches the claimed limitation “one or more computer-readable media having computer-executable instructions that, when executed by the computer, perform the method as recited in claim 1” as (figs. 2&7).

As to claims 18, 33 and 41, Field teaches the claimed limitation “a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions that, when executed by a computer, performs the method as recited in claim 1” as (fig. 7).

As to claims 19 and 54, Field teaches the claimed limitations:

“obtaining input-description-data” as the HTML source (col. 5, lines 15-25);

“automatically generating a set of instructions for filtering input provided” as the pass through publisher 101 retrieves the filter definitions and polices from the filter database 109 for this particular content provider web site. Using filters and retrieved HTML page to parse the HTML source for desired components of the page. Using filters and retrieved HTML page to parse the HTML source for desired components of the page (col. 5, lines 1-30).

Fields does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation “by a computing component based upon the properties of valid input defined by the input-description-data; which define the properties of valid input provided by a computing component”.

Lynch teaches that HTML is a structural language that is comprised of HTML elements that are nested within each other. An HTML document is a text file in which certain strings of characters, called tags, mark regions of the document and assign

Art Unit: 2172

special meaning to them. These regions are called HTML elements. Each element has a name, or tag. An element can have attributes that specify properties of the element. Blocks or components include unordered list, text boxes, check boxes, and radio buttons, for example. Each block has properties such as name, type, and value. The following provides an example of the structure of an HTML document: <HTML> <HEAD> . . . element(s) valid in the document head </HEAD> <BODY> . . . element(s) valid in the document body </BODY> </HTML> (col. 3, lines 30-60).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Lynch's teaching of an HTML document contains valid elements to Fields's system in order to eliminate potentially increased server security risks, compromised forms processing efficiency, and caused user frustration. to Fields's system in order to eliminate potentially increased server security risks, compromised forms processing efficiency, and caused user frustration.

As to claim 20, Fields teaches the claimed limitation "transforming the input-description-data into a data structure" as (col. 5, lines 1-30).

As to claim 22, Fields teaches the claimed limitations:

"transforming the input-description-data into a data structure" as (col. 5, lines 1-30";

"storing the data structures in a persistent form" as (col. 5, lines 20-30).

As to claim 23, Fields teaches the claimed limitation “transforming the input-description-data into a data structure; storing the data structures in a persistent form; wherein the generating acquires the properties from the data structure” as (col. 5, lines 20-30).

As to claim 24, Fields teaches the claimed limitation “loading the set of instructions as an input filter” as (col. 10, lines 15-45).

As to claim 34, Fields teaches the claimed limitations:

“ obtaining input-description-data” as the HTML source (col. 5, lines 15-25),

“transforming the input-description-data into a data structure, wherein the data structure is an organized representation of the input-description-data” as parsing the HTML source for desired components of the page. Typically, this title of the article, the ad banner or banners and the article text itself. These pieces of content are then recast into a new web page by means of HTML templates. The above information shows that the HTML source is transformed into an HTML template. The HTML source is represented as the input-description-data. An HTML template is represented as data structure (col. 5, lines 15-25).

Fields does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation “which define the properties of valid input provided by a computing component”. Lynch teaches that HTML is a structural language that is comprised of HTML elements that are nested within each

Art Unit: 2172

other. An HTML document is a text file in which certain strings of characters, called tags, mark regions of the document and assign special meaning to them. These regions are called HTML elements. Each element has a name, or tag. An element can have attributes that specify properties of the element. Blocks or components include unordered list, text boxes, check boxes, and radio buttons, for example. Each block has properties such as name, type, and value. The following provides an example of the structure of an HTML document: <HTML> <HEAD> . . . element(s) valid in the document head </HEAD> <BODY> . . . element(s) valid in the document body </BODY> </HTML> (col. 3, lines 30-60).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Lynch's teaching of an HTML document contains valid elements to Fields's system in order to eliminate potentially increased server security risks, compromised forms processing efficiency, and caused user frustration.

to Fields's system in order to eliminate potentially increased server security risks, compromised forms processing efficiency, and caused user frustration.

As to claim 35, Fields teaches the claimed limitation "automatically generating a set of instructions for filtering input provided by a computing component" as (col. 5, lines 1-30).

Fields does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "based upon the properties of valid input defined by the input-description-data by using the organized representation of the input-description-data of the data structure". Lynch teaches that

HTML is a structural language that is comprised of HTML elements that are nested within each other. An HTML document is a text file in which certain strings of characters, called tags, mark regions of the document and assign special meaning to them. These regions are called HTML elements. Each element has a name, or tag. An element can have attributes that specify properties of the element. Blocks or components include unordered list, text boxes, check boxes, and radio buttons, for example. Each block has properties such as name, type, and value. The following provides an example of the structure of an HTML document: `<HTML> <HEAD> . . . element(s) valid in the document head </HEAD> <BODY> . . . element(s) valid in the document body </BODY> </HTML>` (col. 3, lines 30-60).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Lynch's teaching of an HTML document contains valid elements to Fields's system in order to eliminate potentially increased server security risks, compromised forms processing efficiency, and caused user frustration. to Fields's system in order to eliminate potentially increased server security risks, compromised forms processing efficiency, and caused user frustration.

As to claim 42, Fields teaches the claimed limitations:

"an user interface for obtaining input-description-data, which define the properties of valid input provided by a computing component" as obtaining HTML sources in

hosting site 103. This information implies that the system has included a user interface to store HTML source in hosting site 103 (fig. 2, col. 4, lines 33-60);

“a filter-instructions automatic generator ("autogen") configured to automatically generate a set of instructions for filtering input provided by a computing component” as generating a filter definition can reference several policies as a set of instruction of selected components (col. 18, lines 40-45; col. 5, lines 10-30).

Fields does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation “based upon the properties of valid input defined by the input-description-data”. Lynch teaches an HTML document is a text file in which certain strings of characters, called tags, mark regions of the document and assign special meaning to them. These regions are called HTML elements. Each element has a name, or tag. An element can have attributes that specify properties of the element. Blocks or components include unordered list, text boxes, check boxes, and radio buttons, for example. Each block has properties such as name, type, and value. The following provides an example of the structure of an HTML document: <HTML> <HEAD> . . . element(s) valid in the document head </HEAD> <BODY> . . . element(s) valid in the document body </BODY> </HTML> (col. 3, lines 30-60).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Lynch’s teaching of an HTML document contains valid elements to Fields’s system in order to eliminate potentially increased server security risks, compromised forms processing efficiency, and caused user frustration.

Art Unit: 2172

As to claim 43, Filter teaches the claimed limitation “ a transformer configured to transform the input-description-data into a data structure” as (col. 5, lines 10-30).

As to claim 44, Filter teaches the claimed limitation “a transformer configured to transform the input-description-data into a data structure; a memory, wherein the memory is configured to store the data structure” as (fig. 2, col. 5, lines 20-30).

As to claim 45, Filter teaches the claimed limitation “a transformer configured to transform the input-description-data into a data structure; a memory, wherein the memory is configured to store the data structure, wherein the filter-instructions autogen is further configured to acquire the properties from the data structure” as (col. 5, lines 20-30).

As to claim 49, Fields teaches the claimed limitation “wherein the interface is a graphical user interface” as (fig. 6A).

As to claim 50, Fields teaches the claimed limitation:

“a memory comprising a set of computer program instructions” as a database includes a list of filters (fig. 2, col. 18, lines 40-45);

“and a processor coupled to the memory, the processor being configured to execute the computer program instructions” as executing a filter definition that can

Art Unit: 2172

reference several policies. This information indicates that the system has included a processor coupled to the memory (col. 18, lines 40-47; col. 5, lines 10-30),

“which comprise: obtaining input-description-data” as an HTML source (col. 4, lines 50-67),

“ automatically generating a set of instructions for filtering input provided by a computing component” as generating a filter definition that can reference several policies to respective selected components (col. 18, lines 40-47).

Filter does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation “which define the properties of valid input; based upon the properties of valid input defined by the input-description-data”. Lynch teaches an HTML document is a text file in which certain strings of characters, called tags, mark regions of the document and assign special meaning to them. These regions are called HTML elements. Each element has a name, or tag. An element can have attributes that specify properties of the element. Blocks or components include unordered list, text boxes, check boxes, and radio buttons, for example. Each block has properties such as name, type, and value. The following provides an example of the structure of an HTML document: <HTML>
<HEAD> . . . element(s) valid in the document head </HEAD> <BODY> .
. . element(s) valid in the document body =</BODY> </HTML> (col. 3, lines 30-60).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Lynch’s teaching of an HTML document is a text file in which certain strings of characters, called tags, mark regions of the document and

Art Unit: 2172

assign special meaning to them. These regions are called HTML elements. Each element has a name, or tag. An element can have attributes that specify properties of the element. Blocks or components include unordered list, text boxes, check boxes, and radio buttons, for example. Each block has properties such as name, type, and value. The following provides an example of the structure of an HTML document: <HTML> <HEAD> . . . element(s) valid in the document head </HEAD> <BODY> . . . element(s) valid in the document body </BODY> </HTML> to Fields's system in order to eliminate potentially increased server security risks, compromised forms processing efficiency, and caused user frustration.

As to claim 52, Fields teaches the claimed limitation:

“ an application program module configured to receive and respond to input provided by a computing component” as (col. 5, lines 1-30);

“an input filter module configured to receive input for the application program module, filter the input, and pass the filtered input to the application program module” as filtering desired components of the page to map to components of a template after parsing components of the page (col. 5, lines 15-25),

“wherein the filter comprises one or more sets of instructions that, when executed, filter the input and such sets of instructions having been automatically generated” as generating a filter definition that can reference several policies to respective selected components (col. 18, lines 40-47).

Filter does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation “based upon the properties of valid input defined by input-description-data”. Lynch teaches an HTML document is a text file in which certain strings of characters, called tags, mark regions of the document and assign special meaning to them. These regions are called HTML elements. Each element has a name, or tag. An element can have attributes that specify properties of the element. Blocks or components include unordered list, text boxes, check boxes, and radio buttons, for example. Each block has properties such as name, type, and value. The following provides an example of the structure of an HTML

```
document: <HTML> <HEAD> . . . element(s) valid in the document
head </HEAD> <BODY> . . . element(s) valid in the document body
</BODY> </HTML> (col. 3, lines 30-60).
```

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Lynch’s teaching of an HTML document contains valid elements to Fields’s system in order to eliminate potentially increased server security risks, compromised forms processing efficiency, and caused user frustration.

As to claim 57, Fields teaches the claimed limitation “a computer-readable medium as recited in claim 54” as (fig. 7).

As to claim 58, Fields teaches the claimed limitation “one or more computer-readable media as recited in claim 54” as (fig. 7).

5. Claims 5, 21 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fields et al (or hereinafter "Fields") (US 6605120) in view of Lynch et al (or hereinafter "Lynch") (US 6558431) and further in view of Motoyama et al (or hereinafter "Motoyama") (US 6095186).

As to claims 5, 21 and 37, Fields and Lynch disclose the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 1, except the claimed limitation "wherein the data structure is in a hierarchical markup language". Motoyama teaches a hierarchical SGML document structure (fig. 3A-3B).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Motoyama's teaching of a hierarchical SGML document structure to Fields and Lynch's system in order to store records following order that allow a user to access records easily.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure
Khandekar (US 6732102).

Contact Information


7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cam Y T Truong whose telephone number is (703) 605-1169. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached on (703) 305-9790. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Cam-Y Truong

8/20/04


SHAHID ALAM
PRIMARY EXAMINER